

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| | APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|--|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| | 10/632,930 | 08/04/2003 | Takeshi Fukunaga | 740756-2641 | 3789 |
| | 22204 7. | 590 06/22/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| | NIXON PEABODY, LLP 401 9TH STREET, NW | | | BREWSTER, WILLIAM M | |
| | SUITE 900 WASINGTON, DC 20004-2128 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | | 2823 | |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 06/22/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | T | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Applicati n No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| Office Antique Comments | 10/632,930 | FUKUNAGA, TAKESHI | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | William M. Brewster | 2823 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the c ver sheet with the c rrespondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>4 August 2003</u> . | | | | | | |
| <u> </u> | action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/356,704. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 080403. 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other: | | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/632,930

Art Unit: 2823

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14-22, 24-26, 38-31, 34-39 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9, 11-17, 19-25, 37-33, 35 of U.S. Patent No. 6,271,101 B1 of Fukunaga. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Fukunaga art teaches the processing steps of a mask, porous layer, polishing or flattening, hydrogenadding, adhering a second substrate, performing two heat treatments, and removing the porous layer.

Application/Control Number: 10/632,930

Art Unit: 2823

فتمرك

Claims 2, 8, 13, 23, 27, 32, 33 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over 1-9, 11-17, 19-25, 37-33, 35 of U.S. Patent No. 6,271,101 B1 of Fukunaga in view of Wolf, V. II, pp. 238-9. Although Fukunaga (101) does not specify using CMP in his claims, Wolf does use CMP. Wolf on pages 238 and 239 states and gives motivation on p. 238, below heading of 4.4.11. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that combining Fukunaga (101)'s process with the application's invention would have been beneficial because, "under RIE etchback conditions designed to reduce such non-planarities (i.e., the oxide/resist etchrate ratio is increased to more than 1.0), oxide spikes are caused (Fig. 4-35a). A chemical-mechanical polishing (CMP) process has recently been reported for removing such spikes. The CMP process can rapidly remove such small elevated features without significantly thinning the oxide on the flat areas."

Claims 1-39 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-20, 22-30, 32-27, 39-56, 59-60 of U.S. Patent No. 6,602,761 B1 of Fukunaga. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Fukunaga art teaches the processing steps of a mask, porous layer, polishing, hydrogen-adding, adhering a second substrate, performing two heat treatments, and removing the porous layer.

Art Unit: 2823

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William M. Brewster whose telephone number is 571-272-1854. The examiner can normally be reached on Full Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Olik Chaudhuri can be reached on 571-272-1855. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

21 June 2004

William Mr. Brunter

WB